



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/955,361	09/18/2001	Fuad Rashid	M-11649 US	9514
33031	7590	11/17/2004	EXAMINER	
CAMPBELL STEPHENSON ASCOLESE, LLP 4807 SPICEWOOD SPRINGS RD. BLDG. 4, SUITE 201 AUSTIN, TX 78759			SCHLAIFER, JONATHAN D	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2178		

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	SF
	09/955,361	RASHID ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jonathan D. Schlaifer	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 September 2001.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-76 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-76 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 18 September 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to application 09/955,361 filed on 09/18/2001, with no prior art filed.
2. Claims 1-76 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 20, 39 and 58 are independent claims.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 23 objected to because of the following informalities: It is an exact copy of claim 22. The examiner notes that judging by the surrounding claims, the Applicant may have intended to have the word “field” be “non-field”. Appropriate correction is required.
4. Claim 48 objected to because of the following informalities: It is dependent on claim 26, but the examiner notes that judging by the surrounding claims, the Applicant may have intended to have it be dependent on claim 46. Appropriate correction is required.
5. Claim 57 objected to because of the following informalities: It is dependent on claim 56, but the examiner notes that judging by the surrounding claims, the Applicant may have intended to have it be dependent on claim 55. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 1, 11, 14, 20, 30, 33, 39, 49, 52, 58, 68, and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzsimons et al. (USPAP 2004/0205452 A1—**

filings date 8/17/2001), hereinafter Fitzsimons, further in view of Hamel (USPAP 2002/0007393 A1—filing date 5/18/2001).

7. **Regarding independent claim 1,** Fitzsimons discloses a method of migrating a Cartesian coordinate-based view to a tag field-based view (in [0090], Fitzsimons manipulates page element geometry) comprising: providing a template (in [0090], Fitzsimons manipulates page element geometry, item 312 being a page layout which acts as a template), associating the template with the Cartesian coordinate-based view (Cartesian elements are associated with page elements); modifying the control to produce a modified control (the control is modified by its associations); and mapping the modified control to the template (page elements are placed into appropriate data structures). Fitzsimons fails to disclose identifying an applet of the tag field-based view, wherein the applet is comprised of a control. However, Hamel discloses identifying an applet of the tag field-based view, wherein the applet is comprised of a control (see Claim 26 and paragraph [0081]), and it would thereby have allowed transmission of ad content. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate an applet into Fitzsimons' view shift in order to facilitate the transmission of ad content.
8. **Regarding dependent claim 11,** it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention that controls may be added to a template to expand the capabilities of the template to suit a user's needs. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add controls to a template to expand the capabilities of the template to suit a user's needs.

9. **Regarding dependent claim 14**, it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention that controls may be deleted from a template to remove excess capabilities from a template to suit a user's needs. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to remove controls from a template to tailor the capabilities of the template to suit a user's needs.
10. **Regarding independent claim 20**, it is a system for performing the method of claim 1 and is rejected under similar rationale.
11. **Regarding dependent claim 30**, it is a system for performing the method of claim 11 and is rejected under similar rationale.
12. **Regarding dependent claim 33**, it is a system for performing the method of claim 14 and is rejected under similar rationale.
13. **Regarding independent claim 39**, it is an apparatus for performing the method of claim 1 and is rejected under similar rationale.
14. **Regarding dependent claim 49**, it is an apparatus for performing the method of claim 11 and is rejected under similar rationale.
15. **Regarding dependent claim 52**, it is an apparatus for performing the method of claim 14 and is rejected under similar rationale.
16. **Regarding independent claim 58**, it is a computer program product for performing the method of claim 1 and is rejected under similar rationale.
17. **Regarding dependent claim 68**, it is a computer program product for performing the method of claim 11 and is rejected under similar rationale.

18. Regarding dependent claim 71, it is a computer program product for performing the method of claim 14 and is rejected under similar rationale.

19. Claims 2-4, 12-13, 15-16, 21-23, 31-32, 34-35, 40-42, 50-51, 53-54, 59-61, 69-70, and 72-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzsimons, further in view of Hamel, further in view of Ladd, Eric et al, Using HTML 4, XML, and Java 1.2, 1999, Que, Platinum Edition, Page 1004, hereinafter Ladd.

20. Regarding dependent claim 2, Fitzsimons and Hamel fail to disclose that the control is one of a plurality of controls. However, page 1004 of Ladd depicts an applet with a plurality of controls. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have there be a plurality of controls because it would have provided the applet with a greater diversity of operations.

21. Regarding dependent claim 3, Fitzsimons and Hamel fail to disclose that at least one of the controls is a field control. However, page 1004 of Ladd depicts an applet with at least one field control. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have at least one field control because fields accept user input from the keyboard.

22. Regarding dependent claim 4, Fitzsimons and Hamel fail to disclose that at least one of the controls is a non-field control. However, page 1004 of Ladd depicts an applet with at least one non-field control. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have at least one non-field control because non-field controls constrain user input.

- 23. Regarding dependent claim 12**, it is a modification of claim 11 in a manner to the way in which claim 3 modifies claim 2, and is rejected in a similar manner.
- 24. Regarding dependent claim 13**, it is a modification of claim 11 in a manner to the way in which claim 4 modifies claim 2, and is rejected in a similar manner.
- 25. Regarding dependent claim 15**, it is a modification of claim 14 in a manner to the way in which claim 3 modifies claim 2, and is rejected in a similar manner.
- 26. Regarding dependent claim 16**, it is a modification of claim 14 in a manner to the way in which claim 4 modifies claim 2, and is rejected in a similar manner.
- 27. Regarding dependent claim 21**, it is a system for performing the method of claim 2 and is rejected under similar rationale.
- 28. Regarding dependent claim 22**, it is a system for performing the method of claim 3 and is rejected under similar rationale.
- 29. Regarding dependent claim 23**, it is a system for performing the method of claim 3 and is rejected under similar rationale. (See Claim Objection.)
- 30. Regarding dependent claim 31**, it is a system for performing the method of claim 12 and is rejected under similar rationale.
- 31. Regarding dependent claim 32**, it is a system for performing the method of claim 13 and is rejected under similar rationale.
- 32. Regarding dependent claim 34**, it is a system for performing the method of claim 15 and is rejected under similar rationale.
- 33. Regarding dependent claim 35**, it is a system for performing the method of claim 16 and is rejected under similar rationale.

- 34. Regarding dependent claim 40,** it is an apparatus for performing the method of claim 2 and is rejected under similar rationale.
- 35. Regarding dependent claim 41,** it is an apparatus for performing the method of claim 3 and is rejected under similar rationale.
- 36. Regarding dependent claim 42,** it is an apparatus for performing the method of claim 4 and is rejected under similar rationale.
- 37. Regarding dependent claim 50,** it is an apparatus for performing the method of claim 12 and is rejected under similar rationale.
- 38. Regarding dependent claim 51,** it is an apparatus for performing the method of claim 13 and is rejected under similar rationale.
- 39. Regarding dependent claim 53,** it is an apparatus for performing the method of claim 15 and is rejected under similar rationale.
- 40. Regarding dependent claim 54,** it is an apparatus for performing the method of claim 16 and is rejected under similar rationale.
- 41. Regarding dependent claim 59,** it is a computer program product for performing the method of claim 2 and is rejected under similar rationale.
- 42. Regarding dependent claim 60,** it is a computer program product for performing the method of claim 3 and is rejected under similar rationale.
- 43. Regarding dependent claim 61,** it is a computer program product for performing the method of claim 4 and is rejected under similar rationale.
- 44. Regarding dependent claim 69,** it is a computer program product for performing the method of claim 12 and is rejected under similar rationale.

45. Regarding dependent claim 70, it is a computer program product for performing the method of claim 13 and is rejected under similar rationale.

46. Regarding dependent claim 72, it is a computer program product for performing the method of claim 15 and is rejected under similar rationale.

47. Regarding dependent claim 73, it is a computer program product for performing the method of claim 16 and is rejected under similar rationale.

48. Claims 5, 24, 43, and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzsimons, further in view of Hamel, further in view of Watters (USPN 5,897,645—filing date 11/22/1996).

49. Regarding dependent claim 5, Fitzsimons and Hamel fail to disclose mapping the controls to specific sequence numbers. However, Watters discloses in col. 11, lines 25-45 mapping controls to a sequence number in order to allow successful processing of control record data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use mapping of controls to sequence numbers in order to allow successful processing of control record data.

50. Regarding dependent claim 24, it is a system for performing the method of claim 5 and is rejected under similar rationale.

51. Regarding dependent claim 43, it is an apparatus for performing the method of claim 5 and is rejected under similar rationale.

52. Regarding dependent claim 62, it is a computer program product for performing the method of claim 5 and is rejected under similar rationale.

- 53. Claims 6-7, 25-26, 44-45, and 63-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzsimons, further in view of Hamel, further in view of Watters, further in view of Ladd.**
- 54. Regarding dependent claim 6,** it is a modification of claim 5 in a manner to the way in which claim 3 modifies claim 2, and is rejected in a similar manner.
- 55. Regarding dependent claim 7,** it is a modification of claim 5 in a manner to the way in which claim 4 modifies claim 2, and is rejected in a similar manner.
- 56. Regarding dependent claim 25,** it is a system for performing the method of claim 6 and is rejected under similar rationale.
- 57. Regarding dependent claim 26,** it is a system for performing the method of claim 7 and is rejected under similar rationale.
- 58. Regarding dependent claim 44,** it is an apparatus for performing the method of claim 6 and is rejected under similar rationale.
- 59. Regarding dependent claim 45,** it is an apparatus for performing the method of claim 7 and is rejected under similar rationale.
- 60. Regarding dependent claim 63,** it is a computer program product for performing the method of claim 6 and is rejected under similar rationale.
- 61. Regarding dependent claim 64,** it is a computer program product for performing the method of claim 7 and is rejected under similar rationale.
- 62. Claims 8, 27, 46, and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzsimons, further in view of Hamel, further in view of Kwong et al. (USPN 6,289,506 B1—filing date 6/30/1998).**

63. Regarding dependent claim 8, Fitzsimons and Hamel fail to disclose mapping the controls to specific sequence numbers. However, Kwong discloses in col. 4, lines 5-25 mapping the applet to a specific sequence number. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use mapping of applets to sequence numbers in order to control execution order of Java directives to optimize performance.

64. Regarding dependent claim 27, it is a system for performing the method of claim 8 and is rejected under similar rationale.

65. Regarding dependent claim 46, it is an apparatus for performing the method of claim 8 and is rejected under similar rationale.

66. Regarding dependent claim 65, it is a computer program product for performing the method of claim 8 and is rejected under similar rationale.

67. Claims 9-10, 28-29, 47-48, and 66-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzsimons, further in view of Hamel, further in view of Kwong, further in view of Ladd.

68. Regarding dependent claim 9, it is a modification of claim 8 in a manner to the way in which claim 3 modifies claim 2, and is rejected in a similar manner.

69. Regarding dependent claim 10, it is a modification of claim 8 in a manner to the way in which claim 4 modifies claim 2, and is rejected in a similar manner.

70. Regarding dependent claim 28, it is a system for performing the method of claim 6 and is rejected under similar rationale.

71. Regarding dependent claim 29, it is a system for performing the method of claim 7 and is rejected under similar rationale.

72. Regarding dependent claim 47, it is an apparatus for performing the method of claim 6 and is rejected under similar rationale.

73. Regarding dependent claim 48, it is an apparatus for performing the method of claim 7 and is rejected under similar rationale.

74. Regarding dependent claim 66, it is a computer program product for performing the method of claim 6 and is rejected under similar rationale.

75. Regarding dependent claim 67, it is a computer program product for performing the method of claim 7 and is rejected under similar rationale.

76. Claim 17, 36, 55, and 74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzsimons, further in view of Hamel, further in view of Orbanes et al. (USPAP 2002/0075311 A1—filing date 2/14/2001).

77. Regarding dependent claim 17, Fitzsimons and Hamel fail to disclose providing one or more model view for a user to select from, wherein one or more selected model views correspond to the Cartesian coordinate-based view. However, Orbanes discloses providing a Cartesian coordinate-based model view in order to provide a virtual perspective on the system. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide model views in order to provide a virtual perspective on the system.

78. Regarding dependent claim 36, it is a system for performing the method of claim 17 and is rejected under similar rationale.

79. Regarding dependent claim 55, it is an apparatus for performing the method of claim 17 and is rejected under similar rationale.

80. Regarding dependent claim 74, it is a computer program product for performing the method of claim 17 and is rejected under similar rationale.

81. Claims 18-19, 37-38, 56-57 and 75-76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzsimons, further in view of Hamel, further in view of Orbannes, further in view of Ladd.

82. Regarding dependent claim 18, it is a modification of claim 17 in a manner to the way in which claim 3 modifies claim 2, and is rejected in a similar manner.

83. Regarding dependent claim 19, it is a modification of claim 17 in a manner to the way in which claim 4 modifies claim 2, and is rejected in a similar manner.

84. Regarding dependent claim 37, it is a system for performing the method of claim 18 and is rejected under similar rationale.

85. Regarding dependent claim 38, it is a system for performing the method of claim 19 and is rejected under similar rationale.

86. Regarding dependent claim 56, it is an apparatus for performing the method of claim 18 and is rejected under similar rationale.

87. Regarding dependent claim 57, it is an apparatus for performing the method of claim 19 and is rejected under similar rationale.

88. Regarding dependent claim 75, it is a computer program product for performing the method of claim 18 and is rejected under similar rationale.

89. Regarding dependent claim 76, it is a computer program product for performing the method of claim 19 and is rejected under similar rationale.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

USPN 6,304,898 (filing date 10/11/2000)—Shiigi

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonathan D. Schlaifer whose telephone number is (571) 272-4129. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JS



STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER